

A
D E F E N C E

Of a Book, intitled, The ²
BELIEF of a FUTURE STATE

Prov'd to be a
FUNDAMENTAL ARTICLE of the
Religion of the HEBREWS, &c.

Occasion'd by
Some Immoral Reflections on the Author and
his Writings, contain'd in the Second Part of
Mr. WARBURTON's Remarks, &c.

In which DEFENCE also,
The Command of God to *Abraham*, to offer up his
Son, is fully consider'd, and clear'd from all
OBJECTIONS.

By JOHN JACKSON, ,
Rector of *Rossington*, in the County of *YORK*,
And Master of *Wigston's Hospital*, in *Leicester*.

L O N D O N :
Printed for JOHN NOON, at the *White Hart*, near the
Poultry, in *Cheapside*. MDCCXLVI.

DEFENCE

OF THE

ARTICLE

OF THE

ARTICLE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE



A
D E F E N C E

Of a Book, intitled,

The Belief of a Future State proved
 to be a fundamental Article of the
 Religion of the HEBREWS, &c.

IN my late Book, intitled, The Belief of a Future State proved to be a fundamental Article of the Religion of the *Hebrews*, &c. I declared my Purpose was to *shew*, that the Religion of the Hebrews or Jews was founded on the Principles of natural Religion, to which Revelation was added; and particularly, that the Belief of a Future State, or Life to come, was a primary fundamental Article of this Religion.

This was very clear and evident to me, and I endeavour'd to make it so to the Reader, without desiring or intending to enter into Controversy with any learned Person, who is or shall be of another Opinion; page 4.

I knew Mr. Warburton was of a different Opinion; and I had not Vanity to think, that he wou'd be any more convinc'd by my Writings, than I had been by his: This was not my View: But the Opinion I had of his Abilities and Manner of Writing, made me resolve not to mention either him or his Books at all, that he might have less Pretence to excite his hostile Spirit against me; and he wou'd now have pass'd unregarded by me, [who was determin'd to mind nothing but Argument, with which I knew he wou'd not trouble me] had his Reflections been ever so rude and unmannerly, for that I expected, if they had not also been *immoral* and *dishonest*.

The Case was this: After I had read his *Divine Legation*, so call'd, I found nothing in any Part of it of real Learning or solid Argument. All is a dark, confus'd Mass, without Light or Order; and the Whole so manag'd, as to expose the divine Mission of *Moses* under a Pretence of defending it; tho' I believe he did not see that Consequence when he first wrote: This was mere pardonable Ignorance; but as he must since have seen it, his Obstinacy and wilful Opposition to Truth is unpardonable.

To

To suppose, as he does, that the Nation of the *Jews* were not taught, nor did believe a future State of Rewards and Punishments, is such a staring Absurdity, and if true, such a Presumption against a divine Revelation being made to them, as will render him who asserts it incapable of proving such a Revelation; and so must needs be a most preposterous and wrong-headed Way of proving the divine Mission and Authority of *Moses*.

Mr. *W.* himself confesseth, [*Div. Legat.* p. 241.] that no Religion ever existed without the Doctrine of a future State. He also says, [p. 438.] that all Legislators, except Philosophers, taught and believ'd a future State of Rewards and Punishments, also that all Nations believ'd it. Yet *Moses*, he thinks, who was no profess'd Philosopher, did not teach it, nor his People believe it. What a strange Circumstance is this, if true? that one who was wiser than the wisest of Pagan Legislators shou'd not teach a Doctrine which they both taught and believ'd, and a Doctrine so important, that no Religion ever existed, or can be supported without it; and that a People having not only the Use of natural Reason, but who were also taught of God, shou'd not believe what all Nations believ'd by the Light of Nature, and what is a necessary and fundamental Doctrine of Religion. This looks as if *Moses* (as his Enemies suggested) had put out the Eyes of his People; and had taken from them, or at least left

left them destitute of the greatest Support of Religion, *without which no Religion ever existed*, that he might support it by a far inferior Sanction, and such as never did, nor ever can effectually support Religion.

But the Belief of a God and Providence always infer'd the Belief of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, if the Apostle knew how to reason, *Heb. xi. 6*. And it is a true and *necessary* Inference drawn from the Nature and Attributes of God consider'd with the Nature and State of Mankind; and therefore it was the general Sense of Men at all Times, from the Beginning, of Jews and Pagans; and there never was a Nation or People known in the most ancient Ages, and before the Light of the Gospel appear'd, which did not believe a future State. So that I have wonder'd that Mr. *W.* shou'd have gain'd any Character for Learning from such Writings as he has publish'd, in Opposition to so plain a Truth; and which cannot be oppos'd without attacking Providence itself, as well as the Evidence of History and Revelation. He aims to carry his Point by mere Effrontery and ill Manners, without either Learning or Judgment: But he is mistaken; and the Age he writes in is too old for him by four or five Centuries; so that Books wrote in so unscholar-like and ungentleman-like a Manner, deserve not any Answer, or any Notice to be taken of them, but Contempt.

These were Reasons which engag'd me not to make any mention of him in my last Book; but I thought the Subject, which had suffer'd and been abus'd by his ill-judg'd Management, deserv'd to be consider'd and defended.

I have therefore demonstrated both from Scripture and Reason, that *the Belief of a future State was a fundamental Article of the Religion of the Hebrews*, which this Man has boldly deny'd. I have also shewn, that the ancient Philosophers did believe a future State, which this Author affirms, by a peculiar kind of Reasoning and Philosophy of his own, that they neither did or cou'd believe, although, he owns, they constantly taught and profess'd it; and by which kind of Reasoning it is easy to prove, that Mr. W. neither does or can believe the Christian Religion.

He owns, [*Div. Legat.* p. 437, 438.] “ that
 “ as to the Legislators who were not Philoso-
 “ phers profess'd, by what can be learnt from
 “ their History and Character, it appears, that
 “ they *all believ'd as well as taught a future*
 “ *State of Rewards and Punishments*---not that
 “ we are to think they credited all the idle
 “ Fables wherewith it had been cloath'd, in
 “ order to lay hold of the gross Imaginations of
 “ the People.”

So he has nothing to charge the Philosophers with, as the Ground of their pretended Unbelief of this Doctrine, but only their Philosophy, which he calls *metaphysical Whimsies concerning*
 God

God and the Soul *, merely because he does not understand it; and yet he allows that these Philosophers constantly profess'd their Belief of this Doctrine, as well as the Legislators did; and they had the same Instructions concerning God and the Soul in the Mysteries, as the Legislators had, who there learn'd the Truth of this Doctrine, and believ'd it; and which was no other than a mere rational Explication of it divested of Fable, than that which was taught to

* Their metaphysical Whimsies (as he calls them) concerning God were; that there was but *one* supreme intelligent unoriginated Being indued with infinite Perfections, whom they call'd God, or *τὸ Θεῖον*. That no other intelligent Being or Agent was *equal* to him, or of *the same Nature* with him. And their metaphysical Whimsies concerning the Soul in the future State were, that the Souls of virtuous and godly Men after Death resided in some luminous Orb, which was the Mansion of their Happiness, and where they enjoy'd the Society of cœlestial Beings and other holy Persons, who had liv'd on Earth; and by divine *Knowledge, Faith* and *Virtue* were united to and had Communion with God, and were blessed with the *beatific Vision* of the divine Perfections. That the Souls of wicked and ungodly Men after Death were banish'd from the Communion both of God and all holy Persons; were associated with evil Dæmons, and condemn'd to a State of Misery and Punishment: These were the Doctrines concerning God and the Soul, which were taught in the Mysteries, and were the *Esoteric* Doctrines of the Philosophers. And these two different future States were also represented figuratively and *Esoterically*; the one by Regions of Light and delightful Entertainments of the Senses; and the other by Scenes of Horror and Darkness, wallowing in the Mire, and being terrify'd with dismal Sight, and tormented in Flames of Fire.

to the People. And supposing the Philosophers in their Explanations refin'd upon this Doctrine, which was both reasonable in itself, and taught in the Mysteries by Priests who were also Philosophers, wou'd any Writer but this Author draw such a weak and absurd Inference, as that they neither did or cou'd believe it?

As our Author farther had ventur'd to dogmatize on other Parts of Literature, in which he is intirely ignorant, I gave a Sketch of the recondite Learning of the Pagans, merely to try his Talents that Way. I have shewn that he knows nothing of the *hieroglyphical* * Learning of the *Egyptians*, nor is vers'd in the Schools of the ancient Philosophers of *Greece* and *Italy*. If he has not quite exhausted his Stock, or has any left, let him produce it, having a Field given him to shew away in; but

* He is so little vers'd in the Knowledge of the *Egyptian* Hieroglyphics, as to think they were the first Letters or Characters made use of to convey the vulgar Language; whereas a Smattering in ancient Books wou'd have taught him, that elementary Letters were far older than Hieroglyphics; and that Hieroglyphics were so far from being us'd to express and convey the vulgar Language, that the Vulgar never understood them at all; and none but the Priests, or they who were initiated into the Mysteries, cou'd explain them; and also that they were intirely symbolical Figures, under which their philosophical and religious Notions only were contain'd. I have given an Account of them, p. 76, 77, 78. and all that this Author hath wrote about them, *Div. Legat.* Vol. II. p. 66—159. is mere Revery and Romance.

as he only rails, instead of making an Answer, it will convince all intelligent and unprejudic'd Readers, (but I was convinc'd before) that he is greatly deficient in Learning and Argument, as well as Manners; and so is forc'd, instead of playing the Scholar, to play the Fool.

Before I proceed to consider the *immoral* Reflections which Mr. *W.* has cast on me and my late Book, wrote in Defence of the *Jewish* Revelation, and upon some other Matters treated of in his Writings, I think it proper to explain more fully the Command of God to *Abraham*, to sacrifice his Son, in the Interpretation of which Mr. *W.* has signaliz'd himself, and is so confident of Success, as to venture, out of pure *Honesty*, as he says, to make an Objection to it himself, and which no one but himself can answer; and his Reply shews over and above the Sagacity and consummate Modesty of our Author.

His Interpretation of God's *tempting* or *trying* *Abraham's Faith* by commanding him to sacrifice his only and beloved Son, is this: "That
 " the Command was *merely* an Information by
 " Action instead of Words, of the great Sacrifice of the Redemption of Mankind, given
 " *at the Request* of *Abraham*, who long'd impatiently *to see Christ's Day*." And this Interpretation he builds on the Words of our Saviour, *John* viii. 56. where he tells the *Jews*, *Your Father Abraham rejoic'd to see my Day, and he saw it, and was glad.* Div. Leg. p. 572.
 Again

Again he says: " The Command was *only* the
 " Conveyance of an Information by Action in-
 " stead of Words --- and that the Action being
 " *mere Scenery* --- it had no *moral* Import."
 See his Remarks, Part II. p. 110. And again,
 " The Act commanded was both in the Inten-
 " tion of God and in the Knowledge of *Abra-*
 " *ham a mere scenical Representation;*" p. 112.

This most extraordinary Interpretation, he
 supposes to be liable but to one plausible Ob-
 jection, which *he holds it not honest to conceal*;
 Pref. p. iii. *viz.* " That it is difficult to con-
 " ceive how a Circumstance of so much Im-
 " portance to Revelation, as the removing one
 " of the strongest Infidel Objections against its
 " Truth, and proving a real Connexion be-
 " tween the two Dispensations of it, should
 " never be clearly explain'd and insisted on by
 " the Writers of the New Testament; tho'
 " the Historian of the Old might have had
 " sufficient *Reason for concealing it.*" To which
he begs Leave to reply, " That it is very cer-
 " tain that many Truths of great Importance
 " for the Support of Religion against Infide-
 " lity, were taught by Jesus to his Disciples,
 " [amongst which, says he, I reckon this In-
 " terpretation to be one] which never came
 " down by their Conveyance to the Church.
 " But being by the Assistance of God's holy
 " Spirit *discoverable by those who devote them-*
 " *selves to the Study of the Scriptures with a*
 " *pure Mind,* have, for the wise Ends of Pro-

“ vidence inscrutable to us, been left for the
 “ Industry of Man to find out, that, as Occa-
 “ sion requir’d, every Age might supply new
 “ Evidence of God’s Truth *to put to silence the*
 “ *Ignorance of foolish Men;*” p. iv. In the next
 Page *he presumes to have discovered* one of these
 important Truths unknown to the Church in
 all Ages, in his Interpretation of the Command
 to *Abraham*. And thus, *tertius è cælo cecidit*
Cato.

But I beg Leave to reply, that it is not the
 Way of the Writers of the New Testament to
 insist on Proofs from the Old Testament, which
 have no visible Foundation there, and more
 especially not to interpret the History of the
 Old Testament, so as to contradict the Letter
 and plain Sense of it; but it is their Way to
 explain the Prophecies, and to insist on other
 Proofs deliver’d there concerning the Messias.
 And this Author’s Explanation of the Com-
 mand to *Abraham* shews very plainly, that it
 was not reserv’d for his Discovery. And if there
 were no better Arguments to convince Unbe-
 lievers, than those he has offer’d, they must
 for ever continue Unbelievers for any thing he
 has said against them. But what, I pray, is
 the *strong infidel Objection* against God’s Com-
 mand to *Abraham*, which he pretends to re-
 move? I know of no real one that the History of
 it is liable to; tho’ I know of insuperable ones,
 which I shall produce presently, against his
scenical Interpretation. There is no Appearance
 of

of *Immorality* in the divine Command, nor can any *immoral* Inference be fairly drawn from it.

First, A Man must be void of natural Reason, that cannot see that God, the sole Proprietor of Life, might consistently with his Attributes deprive any of his Creatures of the Life he gave them, in what Manner, or by what Means he shou'd think fit. This is an evident Principle of natural Religion.

2dly, He must be equally void of Reason, who argues or shall argue, that *Abraham* cou'd not be fully and clearly satisfy'd that the Command to sacrifice his Son came from God, and was not, or cou'd not be a Delusion; because it is evident and demonstrative, that God by an immediate Impression from himself upon the human Mind, can give to it an Evidence of his Will equal to that which natural Reason does or can give us in any Case of Truth or Morality, that is, equal to Self-Evidence or Intuition. So there is no Difficulty there.

3dly, He must be full as void of Sense or Reason, who does or shall argue, that this Command gave any Countenance to human Sacrifices. They who believ'd that *Abraham* had such a Command from God, and was by the same God forbid to execute it, and therefore knew that God intended it only as a Trial of his Faith and Obedience: These, I say, cou'd not think the Command gave Countenance to human Sacrifices, not only without any Com-
mand

mand from God, but contrary also to the divine Intention in the Case of *Abraham*. This, I hope, is also clear.

Nor, 4thly, could others, who either knew nothing of the Command, or did not believe it, think it justify'd their human Sacrifices, which were not offered to God, but to dead Men or deify'd Heroes, who in their Life-time delighted in Wars and Slaughter. And the Foundation of these inhuman Sacrifices was, no Doubt, originally a Delusion of wicked Spirits, who persuaded their superstitious Votaries, that these Sacrifices were acceptable to the cruel and savage Idols whom they worshipped. These were probably older than *Abraham*; and the Command to him, taken in any View, could give no Handle or Countenance to them.

But now, according to Mr. *W.*'s Interpretation of God's Command to *Abraham* to sacrifice his Son being a mere *scenical Representation*, which *Abraham* before-hand knew very well how it would end, would any one imagine he had look'd into his Bible, or that the Scriptures had said, that it was a *Trial of Abraham's Faith and Obedience*? *Moses* says, *Gen. xxii. 1, 2.* that *God tempted (or try'd) Abraham, when he commanded him to take his Son, and offer him for a Burnt-Offering*; and *St. Paul*, in his Epistle to the *Hebrews*, Chap. xi. 17, 19. writes, *By Faith Abraham, when he was try'd, offered up Isaac --- accounting that God was able to raise him*

him up even from the Dead. Is this consistent with a mere *scenical Representation*, the Design and End of which was known to *Abraham*? Had this been all, it would be absurd to say, that God *tempted* or *try'd Abraham*, when there was no Trial at all; or that *Abraham by Faith* offer'd up his Son, if he knew that he was not to be really offer'd. And certainly, had *Abraham* known the Intention of God, that his Son shou'd not be sacrific'd, he would not, as *Moses* relates, have *stretch'd forth his Hand, and taken the Knife* (with Purpose) *to slay his Son*, Gen. xxii. 10. And that he did intend to slay him is evident from the Apostle's saying, that *he accounted* [or thought or reason'd with himself] *that God was able to raise him up from the Dead.* This demonstrates, contrary to Mr. *W.*'s Interpretation and Assertions, that *Abraham* did not know the * Intention of God, but thought it was, that he shou'd sacrifice his Son;

* Mr. *W.* p. 111. cites his own Words from Dr. *Stebbing*, and says, "That *Abraham* very well understood how the *scenical Representation* was to end --- and must needs conclude, either that God wou'd stop his Hand, when he came to give the sacrificing Stroke, or that --- his Son sacrificed in the *Person of Christ* was immediately to be restor'd to Life." Here Mr. *W.* says, that *Abraham* understood very well how the *scenical Representation* was to end; and this he shews by owning in the next Words, that he knew not how it would end: For, says he, he must needs conclude, either that God would stop the sacrificing Stroke, or that, if he did not, his Son would be immediately restor'd to Life; and thus

I

Abraham

Son; and therefore was prepar'd to do it in Obedience to his Command, trusting the Event to God, who he knew was able to raise him up from the Dead. This is the plain Account of the Command to *Abraham*, which was given, as the Scripture assures us, for a Trial of his Faith and Obedience in a most difficult Case, to make him an Example of these Virtues to all his Descendants: And the promis'd Reward which God confirm'd to him by an Oath, was
as

Abraham very well understood the End of the Scenery. *Q. E. D.* that is, *Abraham* knew the End of the Matter very well, argues *Mr. W.* because he knew his Son was to be sacrific'd, or that he was not. Commend me to such an acute Logician, who can prove that a Thing must either be or not be; and by that can prove, that he knows very well how it will be. But if *Abraham* knew how the Scenery was to end, and that God would revoke his Command, and not suffer *Isaac* to be sacrific'd, which was the End of the Matter, what Ground had he to reason with himself, and to conclude either that God would not suffer him to slay his Son, or, if he did, would immediately restore him to Life? It is therefore plain and certain, that *Abraham* did not know how the Command to offer up his Son wou'd end: He knew nothing, but that *Isaac* was to be really offer'd and slain; but God knew and intended that he should not be slain. *Abraham's* Intention was to slay *Isaac*, and God's Intention was, that he should not slay him.

But this is not all which is to be observ'd: *Abraham's* Son, according to *Mr. W.* was to be sacrific'd in the Person of *Christ*. One would think, if the Sacrifice of *Isaac* had any Relation to the Sacrifice of *Christ*, that just on the contrary to what he says, *Christ* was representatively sacrific'd in the Person of *Isaac*, and not *Isaac* in the Person of *Christ*. But our Author is one of the Family of the Wrong-Heads.

as great as his Faith and Obedience had been. *By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, for because thou hast done this Thing, and hast not withheld thy Son, thine only Son; that in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy Seed as the Stars of Heaven, and as the Sand which is upon the Sea-shore; and thy Seed shall possess the Gate of his Enemies: and in thy Seed shall all the Nations of the Earth be blessed, because thou hast obey'd my Voice,* Ver. 16, 17, 18. This Promise is here made to *Abraham*, because he obey'd God's Voice or Command; yet says Mr. W. there was *no moral Import* in it; it was a mere *scenical Representation* of the Sacrifice of Christ for our Redemption, made at the Request of *Abraham*, and the End of which he knew beforehand. Thus his Discovery is a plain and downright Contradiction to Scripture; quite destroys both the Faith and Obedience of *Abraham*, so illustriously display'd and rewarded, and makes him act a mere scenical Part, the Plot of which God had told him beforehand. And thus the most meritorious Act of Faith and Obedience that was ever done by any mere mortal Man, is divested, by his Interpretation, of all its moral Virtue, and turn'd into mere Scenery.

Let us next examine the Foundation of our Author's great Discovery, which is almost as extraordinary as the Discovery itself. He builds it on the Words of our Saviour, *Your Father Abraham rejoic'd to see my Day, and he saw*

it, and was glad, John viii. 56. In this Text, he has discover'd that the Word *Day* has no Relation *to Time*, and does not mean (as vulgar Interpreters understand it) the Appearance or Coming of Christ to bless all Nations, as was promis'd to *Abraham*; which Interpretation one wou'd think was easy and natural. No! but *Day*, he says, means the great Sacrifice of Christ's Death for our Redemption: And for this Interpretation he is not beholden to Language or common Sense, but to something, as he intimates, little short of Inspiration.

Shou'd I indulge his Imagination, and allow him, that the Word *Day* has no Reference *to Time* in the Text, but refers to the Sacrifice of Christ's Death, he wou'd be as far as ever from proving from it, that the History of the Command of God to *Abraham* was a *mere scenical* Representation of this Sacrifice. This Interpretation is plainly contrary both to the Old and New Testament Account of it, as I have shewn. Surely God, after he had try'd *Abraham*, and found him faithful, might reveal to him the Coming of the Messias, who was to be his Seed; and might reveal also, for aught we know, that he was to be a Sacrifice for Sin and for Man's Redemption: There is no Absurdity in this, tho' it cannot be inferr'd from the Words of our Saviour above cited; nor if true, will it favour our Author's Scenery at all. But if we take Scripture for our Guide and
Inter-

Interpretation of the Word *Day*, then *seeing the Day of Christ* does plainly and literally mean no more than seeing his Coming to be the Saviour of the World; and it must be exceeding Joy to *Abraham* to see or foreknow, that the Christ of God, in whom all Nations were to be blessed, should be his Seed, and descend from him. That Christ was the Seed of *Abraham*, and that *Abraham* knew of his Coming, is a Scripture Truth; but we are not beholden to any Discovery of Mr. *W.*'s for it.

The *Day of Christ* or *Day of the Lord* has in Scripture always a Respect to Time, viz. of the Coming, Revelation or Appearance of him. In *Luke* i. 80. the Time of the Baptist's Coming to preach Repentance to the *Jews* is called the *Day of his shewing unto Israel*. And the *Day of the Son of Man* is the Day or Time of his Revelation and Coming to take Vengeance on the *Jews* for their Infidelity. *Luke* xvii. 22, 24, 30. so *Philip* i. 6, 10. 2 *Thess.* ii. 2. 2 *Pet.* iii. 10, 12. so again, 1 *Cor.* v. 5. 2 *Cor.* i. 14. 1 *Thess.* v. 2. And thus it constantly means in the Old Testament; and all these explain *John* viii. 56. viz. that *Abraham* desired earnestly to see the *Day* or the Coming of Christ to bless all Nations; and he saw it (afar off) and was glad. But there is no Text wherein *Day* signifies (as Mr. *W.* says it does, p. 13. and often repeats it) the great Sacrifice of Christ. It has always a Respect to Time: And to think that the Sacrifice of Christ's Death is meant by

the *Day of Christ* in the Text of *St. John*, is a wild Supposition without any Foundation either in the Language or Sense of Scripture.

But Mr. *W.* has, he thinks, still something left to favour his Interpretation; and he tries to make *St. Paul* speak for it by mangling and misunderstanding what he says, *Acts* xxvi. 22, 23. where in his Defence he testifies before King *Agrippa*, that in his preaching the Gospel of Christ he had said *no other Things than those which the Prophets and Moses did say shou'd come* [or more literally, *which the Prophets did say shou'd come to pass, and Moses also*] *that Christ shou'd suffer, and that he shou'd be the first who shou'd rise from the Dead, and shou'd shew Light unto the People* [of the Jews] *and to the Gentiles.* A Man would be a little puzzled to find out how these Words favour his Interpretation of the Command to *Abraham*: The Words do plainly and naturally imply, that the several Things here mention'd relating to Christ were foretold in the Writings of *Moses* and the Prophets; not that *Moses* or any particular Prophet had foretold them all: It was sufficient, if *Moses* had foretold some of the Parts, and other Prophets the other Parts of the Character and Office of Christ. But Mr. *W.* to serve his Turn, and to give Credit to his Discovery of the Sense of God's Command to *Abraham*, stops short at the Words, that Christ *shou'd rise from the Dead*; and then, as if *St. Paul* had meant that the Death and Resurrection
of

of Christ was foretold by *Moses* particularly, he says, *now where, let me ask, in all his (Moses's) Writings, except in the Command to Abraham, is there the least Trace of any such Circumstance, as that Christ shou'd suffer, and that he shou'd be the first that shou'd rise from the Dead? Or in that Command either, if not understood according to our Interpretation?* Pref. p. vi. If our Author hath studied the Scriptures, as he tells us, *with a pure Mind*, it is however evident, he has not studied them with a clear Head: For it is plain and certain, that in the Command to *Abraham*, even according to his Interpretation, there is not the least Trace of the Death and Resurrection of Christ, but only as being typify'd or represented in the offering up of *Isaac*, and his Deliverance from the intended Death; and this Representation is far more rational according to the common Interpretation, than his is. Who denies, that in the Intention of God the offering up of *Isaac* was a Pre-representation or Type of the real Sacrifice of Christ, and this without any of his foolish Scenery? But had he fairly apply'd the whole of what *St. Paul* said was foretold by *Moses* and the Prophets, viz. that Christ should not only die and rise from the Dead, but should also *shew Light unto the People and to the Gentiles*; he would not have been able to shew the least Trace of this last Circumstance in the Command to *Abraham*, tho' understood according to his Interpretation. If he thought that

St.

St. *Paul* meant, that all the Circumstances concerning Christ which he said were foretold by *Moses* and the *Prophets*, were contain'd in the Writings of *Moses*, why did he drop the Circumstance of the Gospel being preach'd to Jews and Gentiles, and that they should be converted to the Religion of Christ, which is meant by *his shewing Light to them*? There is as much Reason and more to apply this Circumstance to the Writings of *Moses*, than the preceding, because it is clearly and distinctly foretold in them; but the other Circumstances are not; nor did St. *Paul* mean to say that they were, but only that they were contain'd in the Writings of the *Prophets*, as they plainly are. Mr. *W.* therefore, to serve a Turn, has misapply'd or perverted the Sense of St. *Paul*, and apply'd to the Writings of *Moses* what properly belongs to the Writings of the *Prophets*; and has dropt the Part that really is contain'd in the Writings of *Moses*, because it would not suit his Purpose, or Interpretation of God's Command to *Abraham*. This is the Effect of his *Discovery*. But what St. *Paul* says was foretold concerning Christ in the Writings of *Moses* and the *Prophets*, is plainly contain'd in them; one Part in the Prophecies of *David*, *Isaiah* and *Daniel*, which relates to his *Sufferings*, *Death* and *Resurrection*; and this not figuratively or representatively only, but directly and in plain and express Terms, as I have shewn in other Writings, and which any one who is but

a very little vers'd in the Prophetic Scriptures, may easily see : And the latter Part or Circumstance is directly predicted in the Writings of *Moses*. *The Scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a Lawgiver from between his Feet, until Shiloh* [i. e. as the ancient *Jews* themselves expound it, *the Messiah*] *come ; and unto him shall the Gathering of the People* [*Jews and Gentiles*] *be*, Gen. xlix. 10. Here it is foretold, that Christ should *shew Light to the People and to the Gentiles*, who should be gather'd or converted to his Religion. Again, *Deut. xviii. 15, 18. Moses* foretels concerning Christ, *The Lord thy God shall raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy Brethren, like unto me ; unto him shall ye hearken ; --- and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him*. In these Passages it is foretold, as well as in the Prophets also, [*Isai. xlii. 6. xlix. 6.*] concerning Christ, that he should preach the Word of God to the People of the *Jews* as *Moses* had done, and that the *Gentiles* also should embrace his Religion : This *St. Paul* meant by his *shewing Light to the People and to the Gentiles*. But with regard to typical and figurative Predictions of the Death and Resurrection of Christ [which have no Place in the Words of *St. Paul*, and which Words therefore have nothing to do with *Mr. W.'s* Discovery] there are several in the Writings of *Moses*, and apply'd to Christ by the Writers of the New Testament. Thus the Sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb related by *Moses* was a Figure or
typical

typical Representation of the Sacrifice of Christ *the Lamb of God*; and St. *John* supposes that the Death of Christ was predicted by it, Chap. xix. 36. The annual propitiatory Sacrifice at which the High Priest entered with the Blood into the Holy of Holies, was a Type or Representation of Christ's Death as a Sacrifice for Sin, and of his Resurrection and Ascension into Heaven, as I shewed, p. 57, 58, 59. And the daily Sacrifice of a Lamb Morning and Evening, for which every one of the Children of *Israel* paid Half a Shekel, which is said to *make an Atonement for their Souls*, Exod. xxx. 15. may well be also thought a Pre-representation of the Death of Christ the Lamb of God, the Price of Man's Redemption. These more strongly prefigur'd the Death of Christ, as being a real Sacrifice, and a Sacrifice for Sin, than the offering up of *Isaac*, who did not really suffer Death; nor was any Atonement represented by it.

What now is become of Mr. *W.*'s Discovery of the Death and Resurrection of Christ being no where to be found typify'd or represented in the Writings of *Moses*, but only in the Command to *Abraham*? and there only, he pretends, *by a mere scenical Representation*, without any *moral Import*? Must we not conclude, that his important Discovery is all a mere Dream, and his *Scenery* fit only for poetical Fiction?

But

But he has an Objection against the common Interpretation of the Command to *Abraham* to offer up his Son ; for he denies that in that Interpretation *Abraham and his Family* were effectually warn'd against offering *human Sacrifices*, by God's revoking the Command : His Reason is ; he says, *they were prejudic'd in favour of human Sacrifices ; the one, viz. Abraham, by his Education in his Country Religion [infected, as he says, with this horrid Superstition] the other, by their Communication with their Pagan Neighbours --- and would be naturally tempted to think as favourably of human Sacrifices, as those Pagans were, who understood that Diana required Iphigenia, tho' she accepted an Hind in her stead.* P. 107, 109. And as if he had done a Feat, and made an Objection that no-body could answer but himself, finally leaves it to his Readers.

I believe a sensible Infidel would be glad to see how this Objection can be answered by his Interpretation ; (tho' there is not the least Difficulty in answering it) for he does not deny, that God gave the Command to *Abraham* to offer up his Son, and also that had he so pleas'd, he might have suffer'd him to have executed it, as he was ready to have done ; and therefore God's accepting a Ram instead of *Isaac* does not, by our Author's Interpretation, and according to his Reasoning, effectually condemn human Sacrifices ; but they might think favourably of them notwithstanding, had they

D

like

like other Pagans *been prejudic'd in their Favour*. For it is nothing to the Purpose to say, (or to prove, if he could) that God was only representing to *Abraham* the Sacrifice of Christ's Death, upon his having before requested it: Might not (will the Infidel object) God represent a Thing by the Symbol of a Sacrifice which he approv'd of? Or does it not rather shew, (might they say who were prejudic'd in favour of human Sacrifices) that God approv'd of them, since he chose to represent a future human Sacrifice to be made by his Appointment, by commanding *Abraham* to offer up his Son? Had he not approv'd, or had he condemn'd all such Sacrifices, he would, say they, have represented the future human Sacrifice of Christ, not by commanding a *Man* to be sacrific'd, but a *Lamb* or a *Kid*: These would have serv'd for a mere *scenical Representation* of Christ's Sacrifice, as well as the offering up of *Isaac*: And tho' God accepted a Ram instead of him, he might have accepted of him, if he had pleas'd; and did not, when he revok'd his own Command, condemn at the same Time human Sacrifices: And so they who were prejudic'd in their Favour, and had before thought them acceptable unto God, might still have thought them to be so. So this Objection might be left to Mr. *W.* as he leaves it to his candid Readers.

But now, tho' Mr. *W.* cannot answer this Objection, yet there is really nothing in it.

Human

Human Sacrifices of innocent Persons being a gross Violation of the Law of Nature, and evident Murder, can never be acceptable unto God ; but must be abominable in his Sight, as most opposite to his Benignity and Goodness. So that there can be no possible Plea for offering such Sacrifices, but an immediate Command from God, the original Proprietor of Life, who alone knows in what Case it may be fit to dispense with the great Law of Nature, and take away the Life of an innocent Person : And tho' there may be in the Course of Providence, inscrutable by us, Reason for God to command an human Sacrifice to be offered to him ; yet we have no Reason to think, that he ever intended to permit such a Sacrifice to be offered : He never commanded it but in one Instance that we know of, and that for a Trial only of *Abraham's Faith*, and would not suffer his own Command to be executed ; which shews, that an human Sacrifice was never acceptable unto him. And it is impossible, without the grossest Abuse of Reason and human Nature, for any to infer from this Instance, that God would approve, or would not condemn such an horrid Superstition. So that *Abraham* and his Family, after they had left the *Chaldaean* Idolatry, and were Worshipers of the true God, could not be prejudic'd in favour of this or any other Superstition which they had abandon'd.

Abraham by Revelation from God left his own Country, that he might not be infected with the Superstition of it; and thenceforth both he and his Family were Worshippers of the true God only. So that Mr. *W.* does great Injury to *Abraham's* Family, in supposing it was too apt to fall into Idolatry, and would be naturally tempted to think as favourably of human Sacrifices as other Pagans did. What! were *Abraham's* Family no better instructed in true Religion than other Pagans were, not even after they became Worshippers of the true God? Were they after that, thinks he, as naturally tempted to think favourably of the very worst Part of Superstition, that is, human Sacrifices, as those Pagans were who offered them in honour of *Diana*? Had they ever thought favourably of this Superstition, they must have known better and abhorr'd it, after they had forsaken the Worship of those Idols to whom such Sacrifices were offered.

But it is more injurious still in this rash Writer to say, that it appears from Scripture, that *Abraham's* Family were but too apt to fall into Idolatry. This is a gross Abuse of that Father of the Faithful and Friend of God, of whom God himself bears this Testimony; I know him, that he will command his Children, and his Household after him, and they shall keep the Way of the Lord, &c. Gen. xviii.

After all, Mr. *W.*'s Supposition of *Abraham* and his Family being prejudic'd in favour of human Sacrifices by the Religion of his Country, has no Foundation in History. Tho' *Chaldæa* was an idolatrous Country, yet the Superstition of human Sacrifices was not practis'd in it either in *Abraham's* Time or many Centuries after. *Philo Judeus*, in his History of *Abraham*, p. 376, Edit. *Paris* 1640. tells us, that the *Chaldæans* did not offer human Sacrifices; nor is there any Evidence, that human Sacrifices were any where offered in or before the Time of *Abraham*, but in *Phœnicia*, from whence they were in After-Times carried into *Egypt*, *Greece*, *Africa*, *Italy*, and other Countries: So the very Foundation on which our Author's Objection is laid, being unsound, sinks of itself: And just on the contrary to what he says, *Abraham* and his Family knew nothing of human Sacrifices before they came into *Canaan*, and could not but be shock'd at the Impiety and Cruelty of them; and this would make the Command of God more trying to *Abraham*, and which nothing but the surest Evidence of the Command coming from God, and the firmest Faith and Trust in him, could have made him resolve to obey.

Thus the Command of God to *Abraham* is clear of all Difficulties; and the Immorality and Impiety of human Sacrifices have not the least Countenance from it, any more than if no such Command had been given.

I proceed to consider that Part of Mr. *W.*'s Remarks, which relates more particularly to me and my Writings. What he says, is contain'd in about fifty Lines, wherein is more *Weakness* and more *Meanness*, than can easily be found in so many Pages of any other Writer of the lowest Class. However, for the sake of vindicating St. *Paul* as well as myself, from his Abuse, I will transcribe his Words, partly for the Entertainment of the Reader with his Reasoning, and partly to shew the Spirit of the Man.

He introduces his Remarks [p. 2.] with this Grimace, *viz. That he would willingly avoid all Controversy, so far as is consistent with a Regard to the Public; to which he has thought fit to appeal; and to which consequently [says he] I have given a Kind of Right to expect either an Answer to all material Objections, or a Confession of their Force.* Thus the Public (as every Mountebank will tell you) is greatly interested in his Drugs, which he vends merely out of Regard to the public Good.

But is the Republic of Letters any way concern'd in his Writings? Have they receiv'd any Benefit or Knowledge from them? Or has he any Voucher or Attestation to shew from the Society of the Literati? I believe *this Public* are well satisfy'd, that he neither can answer any material Objections which have been made to his Writings, and that he is not ingenuous enough to confess the Force of them. The
Public

Public has seen so much of him, as to expect nothing from him of real Learning and Argument, or any Thing but bad Reasoning and rude Behaviour : It is thus that he *answers*, and thus that *he confesses the Force of the Objections* of his Adversaries.

To excuse his entering into a *serious Dispute* with me, he ridiculously tells his Reader, p. 2. that I am one “ who cannot see, and therefore
 “ with a modest Boldness peculiar to the Blind
 “ affirm, there is not the least Connexion be-
 “ tween the two Propositions, an extraordinary
 “ Providence, and the Omission of a future
 “ State.” To which he answers, “ that with
 “ the same Quickness of Sight he makes no
 “ Doubt I would affirm, that there is not the
 “ least Connexion between the old *English* Ho-
 “ nour and the long Omission of a Qualifica-
 “ tion Law for Members of the House of
 “ Commons ; and am therefore to be referr’d
 “ to the Class of those whom he sends for an
 “ Answer to the Story of *Bertrand* and his
 “ *Reading Glasses*.”

The *Public* by this small Specimen sees the great Use of *Bertrand's Glasses*, by the Help of which our Author *without Reading* is able at one View to answer all the Objections which are contain'd in the Writings of his Adversaries ; * and not only so, but is able by their
 Virtue

* He confesses himself to be what he elegantly calls an *Answerer by Profession*, writing what he calls *Answers without*

Virtue to foresee what any of them had to object, and to answer their Objections beforehand. Therefore citing a Part of the Title of my Book, he says, [p. 3.] "That the Reader
 " will see that all my Objections, even to the
 " very *Blunders*, have been obviated or answer'd
 " by him long ago." And to shew his Regard to the Public, and do more than he promis'd, he adds; "An Instance of this, as it now
 " happens to lie before me, will not be *unentertaining*;" then he cites my Words, *viz.* *As a future State may be demonstrably deduc'd from Principles of natural Reason, so IT IS CONTAIN'D in the Proposition laid down by St. Paul: He that cometh to God, (as a Worshipper of him) must believe that he is, and that he is a Rewarder of those who diligently seek him, Heb. xi. 6.*

The Remarker *entertains* the Public with his Observations on these Words as follows: "His
 " Argument [says he] requires him to mean
 " *necessarily contain'd*; but before that can be
 " shewn, it must be prov'd, that God CAN-
 " NOT in this World reward those who dili-
 " gently seek him: And he who should go
 " about to prove that, would go near to con-
 " tradict all which *Moses* has said in the Sanc-
 " tion

out reading over the Books he writes Answers to, as he owns *Append. to first Remarks*, p. 151. But I think he might have left that (which is obvious enough) for others to observe, without bewraying himself.

“ tion of his Law, that God not only could,
 “ but would reward those in this World who
 “ diligently seek him *. But [he adds for Il-
 “ lustration] St. *Paul* knew what he said, tho’
 “ this Man does not: He knew the Proposi-
 “ tion did not necessarily, but *might or might*
 “ *not contain a future State*, just as the Writer
 “ apply’d it; and he deliver’d it accordingly.
 “ First, as he was an *exact* Reasoner; because
 “ (*N. B.*) *the Support of Religion depends not*
 “ *on Rewards here or hereafter; but on the equal*
 “ *Distribution of them*, wheresoever they are

* What then, has *Moses* any where said that God
 would reward in this World *only* those who diligently seek
 him? If *Moses* has not said any Thing like this, our Re-
 marker’s Inference is quite absurd; and what he says, goes
 near to contradict *Moses*, is perfectly consistent with every
 Thing he has said in his Law. For cannot our Remarker
 see, that the Belief of a future State may be a *necessary*
 Support of Religion, tho’ God may also confer temporal
 Blessings on his true Worshipers, when and as he shall see fit;
 since these earthly Blessings are neither the certain or only
 Rewards of Virtue and Piety, or were ever design’d by
 God to be so? And therefore the Apostle may surely mean,
 that such a Belief is necessary for every true Worshipper
 of God to be endued with, and might truly say, that
without this Faith it is impossible to please God, ver. 6.
 And farther, that which *may be demonstrably deduc’d from*
Principles of natural Reason, [as he dares not deny but a
 future State may] surely is a *necessary* Article or Doctrine,
 if it be at all an Article or Doctrine of Religion. This
 only by the Way; for our Remarker’s Reasoning on one
 Hand, and the Apostle’s on the other Hand, will be set in
 a full Light.

“ conferr’d. Secondly, he was a *pertinent*
 “ Reasoner; because he would include the
 “ Sanction of the *Mosaic* as well as *Christian*
 “ Religion: The first of which, as he tells us
 “ elsewhere, had the Promise of the Life that
 “ now is; the other, *of that which is to come.*
 “ This Blunder, (he goes on) as the Reader
 “ may remember, was expos’d in the first Part
 “ of these Remarks, p. 164. But (he adds)
 “ I would recommend Mr. *Jackson’s* whole
 “ Pamphlet to his (the Reader’s) Perusal, as a
 “ *Specimen of that illustrious Band* in which he
 “ has thought fit to enlist, and which indeed
 “ would have been imperfect without this An-
 “ swerer General, *who has all his Life long op-*
 “ *pos’d himself to whatever receiv’d the public*
 “ *Approbation:* And after having written a-
 “ gainst the *Enquiry into the Nature of the hu-*
 “ *man Soul*, does me too much Honour to be
 “ intirely overlook’d; which however it is pro-
 “ bable he had been, but for these Words in
 “ his Title Page --- *the Doctrine of the ancient*
 “ *Philosophers concerning a future State shewn*
 “ *to be consistent with Reason.* This the Re-
 “ marker calls a *vile Insinuation*, intimating,
 “ that he had written something against the
 “ Reasonableness of that Doctrine.”

Thus he has paid *his Regard to the Public*,
 and *entertain’d* them, either with an *Answer to*
my Objections, or *with a Confession of the Force*
of them. But our witty and modest Remarker
 has by his Observations *entertain’d* the Public
 much

much more than he design'd; for it is all at his own Cost, as we shall now see.

First, he charges me with not being able to *see* the Connexion between the two Propositions; *an extraordinary Providence, and the Omission of a future State*; but having a Piece of his Wit to give me, instead of an Argument in Proof of such Connexion, and that he might have a Pretence to send me to *Bertrand's* Reading Glasses, which is our Doctor's infallible Cure for all those who do not see exactly as he does; or, in other Words, are not as blind as himself; he insinuates to the Reader, that I said, *I cannot see*, which he puts in Italic Characters for a Blind; and without this his Joke is lost.

Now I did not say, that *I cannot see* the Connexion between an extraordinary Providence and the Omission of a future State; for who says, *he cannot see* that *two and two* are equal to *ten*? I said therefore, *that there is not the least Connexion* between the two Propositions, which I see as clearly that there is not, as I see that *twice two* are not equal to *ten*. And I can with as much Reason and good Argument infer *ten* from the Addition of *two to two*, as he can infer an extraordinary Providence from the Omission of a future State: And this, which is the Basis of his *Divine Legation of Moses*, is a self-evident Blunder and intuitive Paradox. So that Mr. *Warburton's* Wit is like Mettle in a blind Horse, which frequently makes him

run his Head against a Post. So much for his Joke. But had I said, I cannot see the Connexion between the two Propositions before-mentioned, is it any Wonder, since he himself has labour'd thro' many hundred Pages to make it *visible*, and has not given the least Glimpse of Light whereby to see it? but instead of that, has rais'd such a Dust, as is enough to make it invisible, if it was ever so plain to be seen before. One would think he uses *Bertrand's* Glasses only in the Dark, in Hopes to see what no-body else can see, or can be seen. But this I do see, that the Supposition of the Omission or Ignorance of a future State under the *Mosaic* Dispensation, is a strong Argument against an extraordinary Providence being administred under that Dispensation.

As it cannot be suppos'd, that God would reveal his Will to a Nation of Atheists, or command the Worship of himself to those, who did not believe his Existence and Providence; so it cannot be suppos'd, that he would make a Revelation to those who did not believe a future State, which is a fundamental Article of Religion, and immediately connected with the Belief of the Existence and Providence of God. Therefore if God be suppos'd to have given a Religion and Law to the *Jews*, it cannot but be suppos'd, that they believ'd his Existence and Providence, and in consequence of it, the Doctrine of a future State:

State: Or if they could be suppos'd not to have believ'd this Doctrine, it must have been taught in a Religion which came from God; or else a Divine Religion would have wanted a fundamental and necessary Article of true Religion. So that an extraordinary Providence cannot subsist with the Omission or Ignorance of a future State. *Q. E. D.* And this overthrows all that Mr. *W.* has wrote on the Subject.

Farther, the Supposition of a future State not being an Article of the Religion of the *Hebrews*, or taught by *Moses*, and that they were wholly under a temporal Dispensation, makes that Religion to be in Reality a mere political Scheme, and not a religious Institution.

For if the *Jews* were not taught to regard any Laws, or that they lay under any other Obligation, but the Sanctions of the Law of *Moses*, and that they were to expect these Sanctions to be no other than temporal Rewards and Punishments; how can this be call'd Religion? There are, on this Supposition, under it no Fears to deter the most Wicked and Unjust beyond this Life; nor any Hopes of future Happiness to reward righteous and just Men for their Piety and good Works. Nay, they could not be under the Sanctions to be administred in a future State, or capable of being judg'd, and rewarded or punish'd there, if they were under a mere temporal Dispensation,

tion, and had no Knowledge of a future State. And what Provision in this Case was to be made for injur'd or oppress'd Virtue and afflicted Piety? Or on the other Hand, what Discouragement to successful Wickedness and prosperous Impiety? Many * Cases of both these happen'd under the Law of *Moses*; and therefore to suppose it destitute of the greatest and most powerful Sanctions of all Religion, without which no Religion ever did exist, is to suppose it unworthy of God to give, and of rational Creatures to be under. Thus an extraordinary Providence or Divine Revelation is so far from being connected with the Omission of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, that it is absolutely inconsistent with it.

But

* There is not the least Ground from Scripture to infer, that an *equal* or *extraordinary* Providence in respect of *particular Persons* was administred amongst the *Jews*; but the contrary most evidently appears.

The Scripture tells us how God suffer'd the most innocent, righteous and religious Persons to be persecuted and slain by the most irreligious and wicked Kings and Rulers; and that both *Priests* and *Prophets* were kill'd for doing their Duty, and obeying the Laws and Commands of God.

This was remarkably exemplify'd in *Saul's* ordering all the *Priests of Nob* to be slain for entertaining *David*; when more than 300 of them were murder'd in one Day; and all the Men, Women and Children of the City were without Distinction put to the Sword. 1 *Sam.* xxii. 17, 18, 19. And we may say with *St. Stephen*, [*Acts* vii. 52.] *which of the Prophets were not persecuted?* The Sufferings
of

But the Misfortune of our Remarker is, that he mistakes *Connexion* of Ideas for *Association* of Ideas; and his Head is full of the latter, tho' empty of the former. Therefore he adds for Illustration another very curious Connexion, viz. *the Connexion of old English Honour* [whatever he means by it] with the *long Omission of a Qualification-Law for Members of the House of Commons*. In this Manner *Don Quixot* connected *Giants* and *Windmills*, and all the Reveries of his distemper'd Brain; and till our Remarker shews us some of the Links by which those two Propositions are connected, it may pass (to express it in his refin'd *English*, p. 218.) for an *unintelleſtual Absurdity*.

Next he entertains his Reader with a Specimen, how he has obviated, or would answer what

of *Isaiab*, *Jeremiah*, *Zechariah Son of Jehoiada*, and others of the Prophets are known, and are no less remarkable Examples; that God did not administer an *equal extraordinary Providence* over particular Persons, not even over the best Men and most faithful Worshippers of him under the *Jewish Dispensation*: But those holy Persons, of whom the World was not worthy, had under the Law Trials of cruel Mockings and Scourgings --- of Bonds and Imprisonments. They were ston'd, they were sawn asunder --- were slain with the Sword --- were destitute, afflicted, tormented, Heb. xi. 36, 37.

This shews that Mr. W.'s Assertion of an *equal extraordinary Providence* being administered over particular Persons, as well as over the Nation of the Jews as such, under the *Mosaic Oeconomy*, has no Foundation, and is inconsistent with that very Oeconomy and the History of Scripture.

what I have written : He instanceth in what he calls a *Blunder*, which, he says, *will not be unentertaining*. This *Blunder* is my saying ; as a future State may be demonstrably deduc'd from Principles of natural Reason ; so it is contain'd in the Proposition laid down by St. Paul : He that cometh to God (as a Worshipper of him) must believe that he is, and that he is a Rewarder of them that diligently seek him, Heb. xi. 6.

As an Introduction to the Entertainment of the Reader, I would ask this Inventor of *Blunders*, whether a future State is or is not contain'd in St. Paul's Proposition ? [he will speak out at last, tho' it be to his own Shame.] • If it is not contain'd, then St. Paul's Examples, by which he introduceth it, and which he adds in Support of it, are not properly produc'd ; because, as I shew'd, they are Examples of those who were not rewarded in this Life, but by Faith look'd for the Rewards of the Life to come. Such as *Abel, Enoch, Abraham, Moses*, and others. They are Examples of those who look'd for a City which hath Foundations, whose Builder and Maker is God, Ver. 10. of those who died in Faith, not having receiv'd the Promises (of the Blessings of this Life) but confess'd that they were Strangers and Pilgrims on the Earth ; and desir'd a better Country [than an earthly one] that is, an heavenly ; wherefore God is not asham'd to be call'd their God, for he hath prepar'd for them a City, Ver. 13, 16. Of

Of those who choose rather to suffer Affliction with the People of God, than to enjoy the Pleasures of Sin for a Season; and had Respect unto the Remcompence of the Reward, as seeing him who is invisible, Ver. 25, 26, 27. Of those who were to be made perfect [in Happiness] by those better Things [than the temporal Promises of the Law] which God hath provided for Christian Believers, Ver. 40.

These shew that St. Paul meant by his Proposition, that God was the Rewarder of his faithful Servants and Worshippers in the future State: And therefore if a future State is contain'd in the Proposition of the Apostle, this Remarker is absurd and impertinent in denying what I say; and the least I can do, is to return his Compliment, that St. Paul knew what he said, tho' this Man does not.

I beg the Reader to observe the Exactness of St. Paul's Reasoning, to which our Remarker's is a Contrast. The Apostle says; *He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a Rewarder of those who diligently seek him.* His saying that every true Worshipper of God must believe that he is a Rewarder, shews that the Reward will certainly follow Faith and the sincere Worship of God: But is Faith or true Religion and Virtue certainly rewarded in this Life? If they are not, and the Reward spoken of by St. Paul be that which will certainly follow Righteousness and Piety, it must be the Reward of the Life to

come. Could *St. Paul* say in general of all the true Worshippers of God [for he speaks in general Terms] that they *must* believe that he is a Rewarder of them, and mean that this Reward may be in this Life only, as our Remarker argues? Was ever any virtuous or truly religious Man rewarded in this Life only? If not, then it is evident that *St. Paul* meant to include in his Proposition the Reward of the future State; as being that Reward which will certainly follow Holiness of Life, and which it is the Duty of every good Man patiently to wait for. But as it is not our Duty, or even fit for us to believe that God will reward the true Worshippers of him in this Life only; or so much as to expect temporal Rewards at all; it is evident to Demonstration, that the Rewards the Apostle speaks of, which will certainly attend the true Worshippers of God, and which it is their Duty to believe that he will bestow upon them, are the Rewards of the future State. This Author cannot shew, that any one in any Age ever believ'd a God and Providence, but he also believ'd a future State; and considering the State and Circumstances of Mankind it is demonstrably deduc'd from this Belief. This shews the Exactness of *St. Paul's* Reasoning. And that which farther indubitably proves this to be his Meaning, is his speaking expressly and on purpose of the Faith of those who receiv'd not their Reward in this Life: And in the two preceding Verses which

I

introduce

introduce his Proposition, he instanceth in the Faith of *Abel* and *Enoch*. Now all the Reward that *Abel* receiv'd in this Life for his Faith and Worship of God, was to be slain by his Brother for his very Piety in the Days of his Youth: And the Reward of *Enoch's* Faith is expressly said to be, *that he was translated [into Heaven] without seeing Death; and that God took him.* Was this a Reward in this Life? Nor will our Remarker's senseless Explication, after some *Rabbies*, of the Words as meaning, not a *Translation without seeing Death*, and a *Taking to God*, as the Texts say, but only a *sudden Death*, in direct Contradiction to them, at all help him; unless to be cut off by a *sudden Death* in the midst of one's Days may be called a Reward in this Life, *for walking with God, and having pleas'd him.* The same may be said of *Abraham, Moses, &c.* as I largely prov'd p. 20, 21, 22.

All that our Remarker has to say is; that my Argument requires me to mean, that a future State is *necessarily* contain'd in St. *Paul's* Proposition: *But* (he adds) *before that can be shewn, it must be prov'd that God cannot in this World reward those who diligently seek him.*

I have demonstrated St. *Paul's* Sense; so I might leave him to look to his Consequence, if it was one. But I think any Man but this would be asham'd of such a palpable and pitiful Fallacy; but it is the best Reason he can entertain his Readers with, of whom he must

either have the meanest Opinion, or they of him. What! cannot St. *Paul* mean that God is a Rewarder in the future State, unless he means that God *cannot* reward in this World? Cannot a future State be contain'd in St. *Paul's* Proposition, so as that all the true Worshippers of God *must* and *ought* (which is the Apostle's Sense) in Reason and Duty believe it and depend upon it, and yet God reward them also in this World? Cannot God consistently bestow both temporal Favours and Blessings to righteous and religious Men, and also spiritual and future Rewards? But as God in the ordinary Course of his Providence does not always in this Life reward with temporal Prosperity, nay, does often afflict and subject to temporal Misery, *those who diligently seek* and obey him; all such are taught by the Apostle to believe and expect a certain Reward of their Faith and Well-doing in a future State.

This it is reasonable, this is their Duty to believe, this they must believe, that whatever Reward God shall please to bestow, or not, on righteous and good Men in this Life; they will certainly receive a Reward in the Life to come: This is evidently the Apostle's Sense, and is demonstrable from his own Explanation of it by Examples throughout the whole Chapter. Could the Apostle mean, as this weak Man would have him mean, that God *might* or *might not* reward in a future State *those who diligently seek him*, and then illustrate his Meaning by the Examples

ples of such holy Men and true Worshippers of God, as receiv'd not their Reward in this Life, but only in a future State? Is this treating St. *Paul* as an *exact* and *pertinent* Reasoner? And he must be blind indeed, who cannot see that the Supposition of God rewarding his faithful Worshippers with temporal Blessings, when and as he sees fit, is very consistent with the *certain, invariable, universal* Truth, that he will reward them in a future State; and also that the future Reward only is that which it is the Duty of all to hope for, believe and trust to, who are sincere Worshippers of God, and obey his Laws. This is what St. *Paul* says, every one *who cometh to God, must believe.*

And that the Belief of the Rewards of a future State was always a *necessary* Support of Religion, is evident and demonstrable from the present State and Circumstances of Mankind, and the Dispensations of Divine Providence in all Ages of the World; and therefore no Religion ever did or could exist, and be effectually supported without it. And the Apostle supposes this Belief to have been equally necessary in all Ages, both before and under the Law, as well as under the Gospel-Revelation. He supposes that *Moses, David, Samuel, and the Prophets* under the Law liv'd and dy'd in this Faith, notwithstanding the temporal Promises of the Law; as *Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham,* and other Patriarchs had done before the Law.

And

And this Faith the Apostle makes so *necessary*, as to say in the Words immediately preceding those so largely treated on, *without Faith it is impossible to please him* [God.] And that this Faith is no other than the Belief of being rewarded by God in another Life for good Works done in this Life, is still farther evident from his foregoing Words, Ver. 5. That by this Faith Enoch *was translated, that he should not see Death; and was not found (on Earth) because God had translated him [into Heaven;] for before his Translation he had this Testimony, that he had pleased God:* Then, to shew the Necessity of this Faith, he adds, Ver. 6. *But without Faith it is impossible to please him: For he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a Rewarder of them that diligently seek him.*

But to entertain the Reader to Purpose, this Remarker at last, after all his Confusion, agrees that *a future State is contain'd in St. Paul's Proposition:* For he says, *that he included the Sanction of the Mosaic as well as Christian Religion; the first of which (as he tells us elsewhere) had the Promise of the Life that now is, the other of that which is to come.* So he owns that St. Paul's Proposition contain'd or included the Sanction of the Christian Religion, viz. *the Life which is to come;* and yet, so insincere is he, he would have his Readers think that he has been confuting my Assertion, that *a future State is contain'd in the Proposition laid down by St. Paul.* Is not this a pretty Way of enter-
taining

taining his Readers ; and answering, as he engages to do, *all material Objections, or confessing the Force of them?* p. 2. But though he may treat me as he pleases, is *St. Paul* to be treated in this Manner? And as no-body doubts, or can doubt of *St. Paul's* being an *exact* and *pertinent Reasoner* ; so it is not to be doubted, but that our Remarker is neither exact or pertinent. Logic is by no Means his Talent : He has indeed declar'd War against it thro' all his Writings. But he must contradict whatever disagrees with what he has once advanc'd, tho' it be by the most evident Self-Contradiction.

Our Remarker wants many Qualifications to enable him to make a proper Use of the Scriptures : He has not yet read them with any critical Skill or rational View at all ; and he appears at present to be too *wise in his own Conceit* to learn or become wiser.

But I cannot yet part with this Gentleman, who is really *so entertaining*. To prove *St. Paul* to be an *exact Reasoner*, he says, in direct Contradiction to him, *that the Support of Religion depends not on Rewards here or hereafter, but on the equal Distribution of them* ; and he has no sooner said this, but he owns *St. Paul* included [as the Support of Religion] the Sanction both of *the Life that now is, and that which is to come*. And yet it seems *the Support of Religion depends not on Rewards here or hereafter, but on the equal Distribution of them*. So by this Remarker's Logic *St. Paul's* Proposition

tion *might or might not include a future State of Rewards*; 2dly, *it includes both the Promises of this Life, and that which is to come*; but, 3dly, *the Support of Religion depends not on Rewards here or hereafter*. And thus he has prov'd St. Paul to be an *exact* and *pertinent* Reasoner. This may pass for exact Reasoning with such a Reasoner as our Remarker, who, whenever he attempts to reason, always blunders: But it is neither St. Paul's Reasoning, or that of any exact Writer. St. Paul, on the direct contrary, reasons that Faith in God, as a *Rewarder of those who come to him*, is the Support of true Religion: They are according to the Apostle to rest in this, that God will certainly reward them. He says not or intimates one Word of an *equal Distribution* of Rewards, nor had he any Occasion to mention it.

It is indeed very gross to say, that *the Support of Religion depends not on Rewards here or hereafter*. Future Rewards are the only proper Support of Religion; but temporal Rewards never were or can be so: And he who believes that God will reward his *Faith* and *Virtue* in a future State, has a sufficient Support of Religion, and leaves the Distribution of the Rewards to the *Justice* and *Goodness* of God, and cannot but conclude, that God will reward *every one according to their Works*; which is what he means, or should mean, by an *equal*, that is, an equitable Distribution of them. But our Remarker regards not what he says, if he
does

does but contradict, tho' it be *himself*, for the *Entertainment* of his Readers. He might as well have reason'd, and no doubt is prepar'd to do so, that Civil Laws are not supported by the Sanction of civil Penalties, but on the *equal Distribution* of them.

Our Remarker next *entertains* his Reader, by recommending my whole Pamphlet to his *Perusal*, as a *Specimen* of that illustrious Band, in which, he says, *I have thought fit to inlist*; and which indeed, he adds, *would have been imperfect without this Answerer General*. This I look upon as meant for a Compliment, and as a Specimen of his being an illustrious Critic in the *English* Tongue. The Reader must then try what Sense he can make of *a Pamphlet being a Specimen of a Band*; and be the Sense what it will, if my small Pamphlet be a Specimen of a Band, his numerous Writings, full of *Blunder* and *Rudeness*, must be a Specimen of an *Irish Mob*. But as the Expression is errant *Nonsense*, I am willing that in the next Edition of the *Dunciad* he shall commence *Blunderer General*; and I desire he will take care to do himself Justice.

The Top of all his *Civility*, *Justice* and *Good Nature* is shewn in what he adds next, viz. *that I have all my Life long oppos'd myself to whatever receiv'd the public Approbation*. This unchristian and inhuman Charge is too serious to be entertain'd with any Thing but *Abhorrence* and *Detestation*.

If I have all my Life long oppos'd myself to *whatever receiv'd the public Approbation*, I must have oppos'd the Truth both of *natural* and *reveal'd Religion*, which it has been the unwearied and zealous Study of my Life to promote and defend. Surely his Heart could not but reproach him, when he wrote this Charge against me, which is as false, as it is mean and base; and comes with a very ill Grace from him, whose main Writings are a direct Opposition to what has receiv'd the public Approbation, and will always receive it, so long as the Scriptures are receiv'd. Here, if ever, this *immodest* Man ought to blush, if he is capable of blushing.

I have wrote in Defence of *the Existence and Unity of God*, and of the Truth both of *natural* and *reveal'd Religion*. I have also particularly wrote in Defence of *human Liberty* and *free Agency* against *Atheists* and *Fatalists*; and also in Defence of *Christian Liberty* both *civil* and *religious*, against *Popery*, *Persecution* and *Tyranny*. I have also wrote in Defence of the Scripture-Evidence of the *Resurrection of Jesus Christ* against the *Deists*; and prov'd the Divinity of his Mission and Religion both from his own *Miracles* and *Prophecies*, and the prior Predictions of *Moses* and the *Prophets* concerning him; and also from those of his own *Apostles*, which are the strongest and even demonstrative Proofs of the sacred Truth of *reveal'd*

veal'd Religion. Have I in these *oppos'd* what has receiv'd the *public Approbation*?

I have also wrote an *Exposition of the Lord's Prayer*, and of the *Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*. I have also defended the *divine Mission* and *mediatorial* Authority of Christ the Son of God over the Church, against *Sabellianism* and *Tritheism*, and the blasphemous Anti-christian Doctrines of *Cerintbus* and the *Gnostics*: And what is worst of all, I have oppos'd many Paradoxes of this Author, advanc'd and supported, as he thought, with much Learning; all which I have confuted in a few Pages, and shewn to be nothing but bold Assertions, destitute of Evidence and Truth; and that with all his Glare and Pretences he has not shew'd a Taste of real Learning in any one of all the Points he has treated of.

Have I in all or any of these *oppos'd* what has receiv'd the *public Approbation*? What then does this *Ignoramus* mean by my *opposing* whatever receiv'd the *public Approbation*? Will he to gain the *public Approbation* inlist himself into that illustrious Band, to which indeed I have made it the Business of my Life to oppose myself in Defence of natural and reveal'd Religion, and in Defence of religious and civil Liberty; in Defence also of human Reason and free Agency; and in Defence of Prayer and divine Worship? Or will he rather chuse to act a more becoming Part; to repent of his Rashness and unchristian Calumny, and to ask Pardon of the

Public, if not of me also, for his most injurious Treatment of it ; as if opposing *Atheism*, *Deism*, *Tyranny*, *Persecution* and *Papery* was opposing what *has receiv'd the public Approbation*. Will he not own, that in opposing these I have not oppos'd, but concurr'd with the *public Approbation*? If he will not, I desire he will try his Talents against any Thing I have wrote, which he thinks opposeth the public Approbation ; and that he will let the Public see whether he understands the Scriptures and the primitive Writers of the Christian Church any better than he does *Plato* and *Virgil* : For had he understood the former, he would not have said that the Philosophers neither *did* or *could* believe a future State of Rewards and Punishments. And had he understood *Plato's* Way in his Works of representing his own Opinions under the Person of *Socrates* who speaks them, he would not have pretended, that *Plato* did not believe a future State of Rewards and Punishments, and yet allow that *Socrates* did believe it.

Had he also understood *Virgil*, he would not have wrote such a Heap of Revery about the *Eleusinian* Mysteries, which has no Foundation either in *Virgil*, or any other ancient Author. The Mysteries which *Virgil* alludes to were not the great Mysteries of *Ceres* celebrated at *Eleusis* ; but those lesser of *Proserpine* the infernal *Hecate*. These latter most properly represented *the State of the Dead*, and were

were different from the *Eleusinian* Mysteries. *Apollodorus* relates, that *Hercules* descended into the infernal World after he had been initiated into the *Eleusinian* Mysteries *: And *Virgil* makes *Hecate* reign where *Æneas* † descended; and plainly supposes them to be the Mysteries of *Pluto* and *Proserpine* or *Hecate*, and not of *Ceres*, to which he refers, and embellisheth his Narration with poetical ‡ Fictions. The Sacrifices also are such as were offer'd to the infernal Gods, and not to *Ceres*: And none but *Pluto* and *Proserpine* or *Hecate* are the chief Deities || address'd; nor is *Ceres* ever mention'd as concerned in these Mysteries or Visions of the Dead.

And was not Mr. *Warburton* specially qualify'd to write a Treatise on the *Eleusinian* Mysteries, when he did not so much as know the Place where they were celebrated? He says, [*Div. Legat.* p. 136.] *the Eleusinian Mysteries*
were

* Bibliothec. lib. ii. p. 121.

† —————Nec te

Nequicquam lucis *Hecate* præfecit *Avernus*.

Æneid. lib. vi. ver. 118.

‡ Noctes atque dies patet atri janua *Ditis*. v. 127.

Junoni infernæ dictus facer ----- v. 138.

Hoc sibi pulcra suum ferri *Proserpina* munus
Instituit. v. 142.

| Quatuor hic primùm nigrantes terga juvencos
Constituit. v. 243.

Voce vocans *Hecaten*, cœloque *Ereboque* potentem. v. 247.

---Sterilemque tibi, *Proserpina*, vaccam. v. 252.

Could these be the Mysteries of *Ceres*, where she had
neither Sacrifices nor Invocations offer'd to her?

were celebrated at ATHENS in honour of Ceres. And p. 224. he repeats the Blunder, and says, *Musæus* had been Hierophant at Athens, i. e. in the Eleusinian Mysteries, of which he is speaking. Whence does this learned Remarker think they were called *Eleusinian Mysteries*, but from *Eleusis* or *Eleusin*, where they were celebrated in the Temple of Ceres. Let him consult *Herodotus*, the *Parian Marbles*, *Diodorus Siculus*, or any ancient Writer who has mention'd them; or let him look a little into *Meursius* whom he cites, but one would think had never read.

Our Remarker's Explication also of the *Esoteric* and *Exoteric* Philosophy is all a mere Blunder, owing to his not being able to distinguish between a Proposition or Subject and the Explanation of it. The Terms *Esoteric* and *Exoteric*, with respect to the Doctrine of a future State, had no Relation to the Doctrine or Subject itself, which was taught and profess'd equally amongst the Philosophers and amongst the Vulgar: But the Philosophers explain'd it in a different Manner in their popular and political Discourses, from what they did in their Lectures to their Disciples; the first was the *Exoteric* Way, the second the *Esoteric*: And this was the Case in respect of Theology in general; and this is all the Mystery of *Esoterics* and *Exoterics*, which our Remarker has made so much Work about; and infers from it most absurdly, that the Philosophers, tho' they profess'd

fess'd and taught, did not believe a future State of Rewards and Punishments.

I may leave the Consideration of his vile and *immoral* Charge to every honest and Christian Reader, who must see and think, that it proceeded from Gaul and Bitterness of Spirit, and a very corrupt Heart. But I will tell him, that such Kind of Slander and Calumny is not the Way to save a sinking Character. However, I could not desire a greater Revenge upon him, than that he should be oblig'd to try his boasted Abilities in confuting all or any Thing I have wrote. Nay, I will be so fair, since I presume he has not studied, or knows any Thing of the Subjects of the greatest Part of my Writings, as to task him only with a Defence of himself against my last Book wrote on the Subjects, which he pretends to have consider'd and to understand.

But what must all serious Persons and Men of Learning think of such a Writer, who by mere Self-Conceit imagining himself possess'd of what he really has not, takes upon him to abuse at random every one who differs in Opinion from him. But as his Learning will never hurt any one, so his abusive and unchristian Behaviour will hurt no one but himself.

I have indeed wrote in Defence of the *Jewish* Revelation, and in it have oppos'd several absurd Notions of this Remarker; but I have been so far from abusing him, or casting the least

least Reflection on him or his Writings, that I never so much as mention'd his Name or Writings at all : Indeed I did not think them worth my Notice.

For this I am call'd *blind, Blunderer, Answerer General, and one who have all my Life long oppos'd myself to whatever receiv'd the public Approbation*, with other such like Slander. Thus it is *he answers*, as he promis'd the Public, p. 2. *all material Objections made against his Writings, or confesseth the Force of them.* All I have to say is, that he is welcome to oppose, as far as he is able, any or every Thing I have wrote, which clatheth with his Opinion : But then I expect him to do it with hard Arguments, and not with hard Names ; and that he write like a *moral* Man at least, if not like a *Scholar* ; because the first is in his Power, tho' the latter may not be so. I have not yet seen any Thing of the Scholar or judicious Learning in any of his Writings ; but instead thereof have seen a great many Citations of *Greek* and *Latin* Authors, which have no Relation to his Subject, and serve only for Shew and Digression * ; also many bold and
empty

* As he exercises his critical Talent on some of the Passages he cites, it may not be improper to observe his Acuteness in an Instance or two, out of many I might produce: One in *Greek*, and one in *Latin*. These two fell in my Way accidentally, as I was looking over his learned Dissertation on what he calls the *Eleusinian Mysteries*.

empty Assertions call'd *Demonstrations*; and instead of Arguments and Reasoning, downright Bullying, Railing, and personal Abuse and immodest Reflections; and as I have had no small Share of them, I tell him that I heartily despise them, and pity the Author of them.

steries. The first is a Citation of *Arrian's Epictetus. Disfert. lib. iii. c. 21.* ἔτως ὠφέλιμα γίνεται τὰ μυστηρία· ἔτως Εἰς ΦΑΝΤΑΣΙΑΝ ἱερόμεθα, ὅτι ἐπὶ παιδείᾳ καὶ ἐπανορθώσει τῇ βίῃ κατεσθῆ πάντα ταῦτα ὑπὸ τῶν παλαιῶν. The Words εἰς Φαντασίαν ἱερόμεθα he calls an *obscure Expression* (*Div. Leg. p. 139.*) but that nothing may seem too hard for him, he translates it, *we seize the true Spirit of them.* Now, *seizing the true Spirit of them* is but a coarse Expression, if it was the Sense of the Author; but as to that, he might as well have translated it any Thing else. The Expression is plain and easy enough, and means; *we come to the Perception* (or Knowledge) *that all these Things* [he had mention'd before] *were instituted by the Ancients for Instruction and Reformation of Life.*

So I advise him, when any more *obscure Expressions* come in his Way, that he will not venture to translate them, since he is so unlucky at doing it.

The other is a Passage in *Virgil*, which he cites p. 209. *Hos juxta, falso damnati crimine mortis, Æn. vi. ver. 430.* *Virgil* says, that at the Entrance of Hades, near to those innocent Infants who were snatch'd from their Mothers Breasts to the Grave, they were plac'd *who were unjustly condemn'd to Death.* Can any Thing be easier than this Explication? Or can any more proper Place be assign'd to those who suffer'd Death by an unjust Sentence, than amongst those who died immaturally in their infant State? Yet he would have the Place corrected without any Evidence or Authority, and read, *falso damnati tempore mortis.* As if *Virgil* had alluded to the Fable of *Plato's Gorgias*, which no Doubt was as far from his Thoughts, as our Author's Emendation of his Verse was. But *Virgil* is too dangerous a Writer for such a Critic to tamper with.

Not knowing what to say against my Book, he intimates that he should not have taken notice of me (to abuse me, for this is all the Notice he has taken of me) but for the *Words in my Title Page*, viz. *The Doctrine of the ancient Philosophers concerning a future State shewn to be consistent with Reason*. This he calls a *vile Insinuation*, intimating, that he had written something against the Reasonableness of that Doctrine. This, I suppose, was to excuse his unrighteous Charge before-mention'd; and thus he adds *Sin to Sin*, thro' Hardness and Impenitency. But what Doctrine [I pray this acute Logician to explain] do I intimate he has wrote something against? Does he mean against the Doctrine of the ancient Philosophers concerning a future State, for my Title Page speaks of nothing else? If so; has he not wrote a great Part of his Books to prove, that the ancient Philosophers in expressing their Notions of the future State, have so explain'd it, as to shew that they did not believe it at all; nay, what is more extraordinary, *that they could not believe it*? Will he deny this? Tho' it is a gross Misrepresentation of the ancient Philosophers; the Reasonableness of whose Doctrine in this Point, and their actual Belief of it, I have shewn at large. But if he means to charge me with having *insinuated*, that he had wrote something against the Reasonableness of a future State, I will leave it to every Reader of common Sense, whether my Words insinuate

nuate any Thing he chargeth them with, or will bear to be so understood. I speak only of the Doctrine of the *ancient Philosophers*; and I do not find, that he has pleaded for the *Reasonableness* of their Doctrine; but on the contrary I find, that he has endeavour'd to shew that their Doctrine is inconsistent with any future State of Rewards and Punishments. So if any Thing be insinuated, (for I neither mention him or any of his Writings) it can only be, that he has wrote something against the Doctrine of the ancient Philosophers concerning a future State, which he knows he has wrote against, tho' very weakly.

I doubt not, therefore, but he took notice of me in an abusive Way, merely because he knows he cannot answer me in a Scholar-like Way. Railing and Calumny are his Talent; and he may enjoy the unmanly Triumphs of them over his Adversaries with as much Pleasure as he can.

I could easily shew (if it was worth while) the Weakness and Absurdity of every other Notion advanc'd in our Remarker's Writings, which are in this Respect all of a Piece: But as he is in the Hands of others, who are able (if they will mispend a little Time) to confute, but not to convince him; so I should not have troubled the Public with the preceding Confutation of so vain and empty a Writer, (who would have pass'd unobserv'd by me) if his

immoral Reflections had not made a Defence of myself both just and necessary.

Mr. *Warburton*, no Doubt, will be so partial to himself, as to think that I have been too severe with him: But he who has so outrageously and no less unjustly and unprovok'd abus'd so many learned and worthy Men, has no Cause to complain of meeting with some of that Correction, which he justly deserves. And if his own Heart does not condemn him for many Things he has said, I shall be sorry for him, and pity his Condition, as being worse than that of a mere Infidel.

But if any Thing I have said shall do him any Good, and make him reflect on his own, bad Conduct and Behaviour, I shall be glad, and hope that in Time he will come to a modest Way of thinking of his own Talents; which, whatever they are, are employ'd to very bad Purpose; and I am sure have nothing in them, to give him a Superiority over those he treats with so much Haughtiness and Contempt. He is but a *Novitiate* lately come from School, and a Stranger in the learned World; and wants much to learn, and especially to know how to behave as a Gentleman as well as a Scholar. And till he shews more Judgment, and mends his Manners, they who are possess'd with either, will have nothing to do with him.

It is probable that he will again fly out into Abuse, having nothing else left. But as I have given him no Occasion for it, and said nothing but in the Way of Reason and Argument, and in the just Vindication of myself from personal Calumny, I cannot think of mispending my Time about such a Writer; and therefore I take my Leave of him, wishing him both a sounder Head and a better Heart.

F I N I S.

E R R A T A.

Page 8, line 9, read *more*. l. 33, read *Exoterically*.
p. 14, l. 10, read *inhumane*.



Books printed for J. NOON, at the White-Hart,
near Mercers-Chapel, in Cheapside.

1. **H**ermanni Boerhaave ΦΥΣΙΟΛΟΓΙΚΗ, seu Oeconomia Animalis, Æreis Tabulis 54, eleganter insculptis, illustrata: In quibus, humani Corporis partes, dilucide & distincte exhibentur.

2. A new Version of St. Matthew's Gospel, with select Notes; wherein the Version is vindicated, and the Sense and Purity of several Words and Expressions in the Original are settled, and illustrated from Authors of establish'd Credit. To which is added, a Review of Dr. Mills's Notes on this Gospel, correcting that great Man's many Mistakes and Errors, and supplying his Omissions. By Daniel Scott, L. L. D.

3. A Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Colossians, Philippians, and Hebrews: after the Manner of Mr. Locke. To which are annex'd, several critical Dissertations on particular Texts of Scripture. By the late Reverend Mr. James Pierce of Exon. 2d Edition.

4. A Paraphrase and Notes on the Revelation of St. John; with large Historical Observations, and a Preface giving an Account of the Design and Use of this Book; with a Scheme and Use of the Prophecies. By Moses Lowman.

5. A Paraphrase with Notes on the Revelation of St. John, in the Manner of Dr. Clarke; with a Preface concerning the Usefulness and Intelligibleness of that Book. By Thomas Pyle, M. A. Prebendary of the Cathedral Church of Salisbury.

6. A Paraphrase on the seven Catholick Epistles: after the Manner of Dr. Clarke on the four Evangelists. Useful for Families.

7. A Paraphrase and critical Commentary on the Prophecy of Joel. By Samuel Chandler.

8. The curious and useful Sermons of the Reverend Mr. James Foster. 4th Edition. 4 vol. 8vo.

9. The same Gentleman's Defence of the Usefulness, Truth, and Excellency of the Christian Revelation, in answer to Christianity as old as the Creation. 3d Edition.

10. His three Letters to Dr. Stebbing on the Subject of Heresy. 2d Edition.

BOOKS printed for J. NOON, at the White-Hart.

11. A free and impartial Study of the holy Scriptures recommended. In 3 vols. 8vo. Containing Notes on many peculiar Texts of Scripture, and Discourses on various Subjects. By *Joseph Hallett, jun.*

12. The Laws and Liberties of the Gospel: or, The Duties and Privileges common to all Christians explain'd and recommended in several practical Discourses. Designed to promote Christian Truth and Charity, Peace and Unity. By *Gilbert Michell, M. A.* Rector of Bredfall near Derby.

13. Fifteen Sermons on several Occasions. To which is added, a Scripture Catechism, or the Principles of the Christian Religion laid down in the Words of the Bible. By the late Rev. Mr. *James Pierce.*

14. Funeral Discourses: In two Parts. Containing, 1. Consolations on the Death of our Friends. 2. Preparations for our own Death. By *William Harris, D. D.*

15. *Novitiana opera, cum copiosissimis Observationibus & Notis, in quibus totum argumentum auctoris de Regula Fidei ex veterum Patrum Monumentis latè discutitur. Præmittitur Dissertatio de Filii Dei Homœousio, sive Coessentialitate uni Deo Patri. Studio Johannis Jackson, Eccles. Angl. Presb.*

16. A second Edition of a Defence of Human Liberty, in answer to the principal Arguments which have been alledged against it, and particularly to Cato's Letters on that Subject. To which is added, a Vindication of Human Liberty: In answer to a Dissertation on Liberty and Necessity; written by *A. C. Esq;* By *John Jackson* Rector of Rossington in the County of York, and Master of Wigston's Hospital in Leicester.

17. *Cyropædia*: or, the Institution of Cyrus, concerning Religion and Government. Translated from the Greek Original of Xenophon, by the late honourable *Maurice Ashley, Esq;* (Brother to the late Earl of Shaftsbury.) Address'd to the Lady Elizabeth Harris, in a Dissertation upon the true Liberty of thinking in Matters both Ecclesiastical and Civil. By the Translator. In two vol. 8vo.

18. The History of the Sevarambians, a People of the South Continent: In five Parts. Containing an Account
of

Books printed for J. Noon, at the White-Hart.

of the Government, Laws, Religion, Manners, and Language of that Nation. Translated from the Memoirs of Capt. *Siden*, who lived near fifteen Years amongst them.

19. A Treatise of Human Nature ; being an Attempt to introduce the experimental Method of Reasoning into moral Subjects : Wherein the Nature of the Understanding and Passions is examined and explained. In 2 vol. 8vo.

Rara temporum felicitas, ubi sentire quæ velis, & quæ sentias dicere licet. Tacit.

20. The Philosophical Grammar of Experimental, Natural Philosophy, in the familiar Way of Dialogue ; adapted to the Capacities of Youth, and illustrated with Variety of Copper-plates, Maps, &c. The 2d Edition, with large Additions. By *B. Martin*.

21. The Principles of Moral and Christian Philosophy : In two Volumes. Vol. I. Containing Moral Philosophy. An Enquiry into the wise and good Government of the Moral World. In which the Continuance of good Administration, and due Care about Virtue for ever, is inferred from the present Order in all Things, in that Part chiefly where Virtue is concerned. Vol. II. Containing Christian Philosophy. The Christian Doctrine concerning God, Providence, Virtue, and a future State, proved to be agreeable to true Philosophy, and to be attended with a truly philosophical Evidence. By *George Turnbull*, L. L. D.

22. A Methodical System of Universal Law : or, the Laws of Nature and Nations, deduced from certain Principles, and applied to proper Cases. Written in Latin by the celebrated *Jo. Got. Heineccius*, Counsellor of State to the King of Prussia, and Professor of Philosophy at Hall. Translated, and illustrated with Notes and Supplements, by *George Turnbull*, L. L. D. To which is added, a Discourse upon the Nature and Origin of Moral and Civil Laws ; in which they are deduced, by an Analysis of the Human Mind in the experimental Way, from our internal Principles and Dispositions. In 2 vol.

23. The Elements of all Geometry. Containing, 1. The Rudiments of Decimal Arithmetick, Logarithms, and Algebra. 2. *Euclid's* Elements of plain and solid Geometry demonstrated in an easy Method for Learners without a Master. 3. The Elements of Spherical Geometry, after the Manner of *Euclid*, &c.